

MAYER BROWN LLP  
LEE H. RUBIN (SBN 141331)  
lrubin@mayerbrown.com  
EDWARD D. JOHNSON (SBN 189475)  
wjohnson@mayerbrown.com  
DONALD M. FALK (SBN 150256)  
dfalk@mayerbrown.com  
ERIC B. EVANS (SBN 232476)  
eevans@mayerbrown.com  
ANNE M. SELIN (SBN 270634)  
aselin@mayerbrown.com  
Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 300  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112  
Telephone: (650) 331-2000  
Facsimile: (650) 331-2061

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Google Inc.*

[Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

**IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:**

## ALL ACTIONS

**Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK**

**DEFENDANTS' JOINT RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL REGARDING  
FILINGS RELATED TO PLAINTIFFS'  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
JOINT MOTIONS *IN LIMINE***

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11 and 79-5, defendants Adobe Systems, Inc. (“Adobe”), Apple Inc. (“Apple”), Google Inc. (“Google”), Intel Corporation (“Intel”), and Intuit Inc. (“Intuit”) (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby jointly respond to Plaintiffs’ Administrative Motion to Seal Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) and (e) (ECF No. 879). Defendants hereby jointly move to seal redacted portions of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motions *In Limine* (“Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Motions *In Limine*”), as well as the following exhibits to the Declaration of Anne B. Shaver In Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motions *In Limine* (“Shaver Declaration Exhibits”):

- i. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 1 (proposed redacted version submitted herewith);
- ii. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 13 (November 25, 2013 Expert Report of Kevin Murphy) (proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 846);
- iii. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 14 (December 6, 2013 Expert Report of Edward Snyder) (proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 842);
- iv. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 15 (November 25, 2013 Expert Report of Eric Talley) proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 842-2);
- v. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 17 (December 11, 2013 Reply Expert Report of Matthew Marx) (proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 832-2);
- vi. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 18 (October 28, 2013 Expert Report of Edward Leamer) (proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 856-8);
- vii. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 19 (December 11, 2013 Expert Report of Edward Leamer) (proposed redacted version previously submitted at ECF No. 856-10);
- viii. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 80 (proposed redacted version submitted herewith);
- ix. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 278 (proposed redacted version submitted herewith);
- x. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 279 (proposed redacted version submitted herewith); and
- xi. Shaver Declaration Exhibit 281A (proposed redacted version submitted herewith).

1       The redacted information has been designated Confidential or Attorneys' Eyes Only  
 2 under the Stipulated Protective Order (Modified by the Court) (ECF No. 107). Defendants are  
 3 concurrently filing declarations in support of the respective sealing requests and a proposed order  
 4 listing each document sought to be sealed and the specific support for each request.

5       **I. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO SEAL DEFENDANTS' CONFIDENTIAL**  
 6 **INFORMATION IN PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTIONS IN LIMINE**  
 7 **AND THE SHAVER DECLARATION EXHIBITS**

8       Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides broad discretion for a trial  
 9 court to permit sealing of court documents for, *inter alia*, the protection of "a trade secret or other  
 10 confidential research, development, or commercial information." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(G).  
 11 The Ninth Circuit has "carved out an exception to the presumption of access to judicial records  
 12 for a sealed discovery document [attached] to a nondispositive motion," where the requesting  
 13 party shows good cause exists to keep the records under seal. *Navarro v. Eskanos & Adler*, No.  
 14 C-06 02231, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24864, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. March 22, 2007) (citing *Kamakana*  
 15 *v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006) ("[A] 'particularized showing'  
 16 under the 'good cause' standard of Rule 26(c) will 'suffice[] to warrant preserving the secrecy of  
 17 sealed discovery material attached to nondispositive motions."); *see also Pintos v. Pacific*  
 18 *Creditors Assoc.*, 565 F.3d 1106, 1115 (9th Cir. 2009) ("In light of the weaker public interest in  
 19 nondispositive materials, we apply the 'good cause' standard when parties wish to keep them  
 20 under seal.").

21       The redacted portions of the materials Defendants seek to seal contain highly confidential  
 22 and commercially sensitive information about employee compensation, including Defendants'  
 23 compensation data as well as information that reflects Defendants' internal business strategies  
 24 related to compensation and internal assessments of their and other employers' competitive  
 25 position in the labor market. Defendants also seek to keep under seal materials that reflect  
 26 confidential hiring data, which reveal confidential recruiting and hiring strategies, practices, and  
 27 policies. Defendants further seek to keep under seal information in business contracts which

1 reflect internal business strategies, policies, and practices. Finally, defendants seek to keep  
 2 under seal the personal identifying or private information of employees and third parties.  
 3 Defendants designated the foregoing information “Confidential” or “Attorneys Eyes Only” under  
 4 the Protective Order.

5 This Court has sealed substantially similar compensation and recruiting information in  
 6 this case, including in its recent sealing order dated March 14, 2014. *See Order Granting in Part*  
 7 *and Denying in Part Motions to Seal dated March 14, 2014 (ECF No. 730); Order Granting in*  
 8 *Part and Denying in Part Motions to Seal dated September 30, 2013 (ECF No. 509).* Moreover,  
 9 as each of the Defendants’ separately filed declarations demonstrate, Defendants kept the sealed  
 10 information confidential and the public disclosure of this information would cause each  
 11 Defendant harm by giving third-parties (including individuals responsible for competitive  
 12 decision-making) insights into confidential and sensitive aspects of each of the Defendants’  
 13 strategies, competitive positions, and business operations, allowing these third-parties to  
 14 potentially gain an unfair advantage in dealings with and against each of the Defendants.

15 A portion of the sealed information is employee compensation data. This type of  
 16 information is regularly sealed because of its confidential and private nature. *See Renfro v.*  
 17 *Unum*, No. 09-2661, 2010 BL 104197 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2010) (granting a motion to seal  
 18 records containing plaintiffs’ salary information); *Nettles v. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, No. C06-5164,  
 19 2007 WL 858060, at \*2, 2007 BL 247444 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 16, 2007) (holding that salary  
 20 review notices for third parties “who have not chosen to have their salary history placed into the  
 21 public record” could be sealed.); *EEOC v. Kokh, LLC*, No. CIV-07-1043, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 22 82526, at n.1, 2010 BL 187807 (W.D. Okla. Aug. 09, 2012) (noting that portions of summary  
 23 judgment materials were filed under seal because they contained “confidential salary  
 24 information.”).

25 Similarly, compensation policies, practices and decisions are routinely subject to a  
 26 sealing order. *In re Wells Fargo Loan Processor Overtime Pay Litigation*, No. C 07-01841, at  
 27 \*16, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53616, 2008 BL 123131 (N.D. Cal. June 09, 2008) (noting that a

1 “compensation policy” was filed under seal); *Hertz Equip. Rental Co. v. Useda*, No. CV-10-  
 2 4953, 2010 BL 259718, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 02, 2010) (granting a temporary restraining order  
 3 to enjoin a former employee from using a company’s “confidential and/or trade secret employee  
 4 compensation information”).

5 In addition, good cause exists to seal confidential information relating to a company’s  
 6 internal business, recruiting or hiring practices, strategies and policies, including confidential  
 7 analyses of a company’s market position. *See Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(c)(1)(G)* (permitting sealing  
 8 of “a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information”);  
 9 *Krieger v. Atheros Commc’ns, Inc.*, Case No. 11-CV-00640, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68033 at  
 10 \*3-4 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2011) (holding that a company could seal a presentation from its  
 11 investment adviser that contained “sensitive and confidential information, including long-term  
 12 financial projections, discussions of business strategy, and competitive analyses”); *Network  
 13 Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.*, Case No. C-07-06053, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21721,  
 14 at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010) (sealing “internal information regarding [defendant’s] business  
 15 strategies and opportunities that were not widely distributed”); *see also TriQuint Semiconductor,  
 16 Inc. v. Avago Techns. Ltd.*, Case No. CV 09-531, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 143942, at \*9 (D. Ariz.  
 17 Dec. 13, 2011) (granting motion to seal “market analysis information,” under “compelling”  
 18 reason standard applicable to dispositive motions, including a “spreadsheet tracking information  
 19 regarding potentially competitive products,” and other business strategy documents, such as  
 20 information relating to “product competitiveness, and market and technological opportunities  
 21 and risks”).

22 Moreover, the redacted information constitutes trade secrets, defined as “any formula,  
 23 pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives  
 24 him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it.”  
 25 *Samsung*, 727 F.3d at 1221-22. As evidenced by the accompanying declarations, the information  
 26 Defendants seek to seal relate to Defendants’ internal business practices and strategies used in  
 27 compensating, recruiting, and hiring employees, as well as the confidential terms of business

1 agreements. This falls plainly within the trade secrets definition. *Id.*; see also *In re Electronic*

2 Arts, Inc., 298 F. App'x. 568, 569-70 (9th Cir. 2008).

3 Good cause also exists for sealing the identities and personal contact information of  
4 specific employees or applicants that are contained in the Sealed Materials. These employees or  
5 applicants have not sought to make their identities known or placed in the public record. *Nettles*  
6 at \*2 (holding that the interests of private parties outweighed the public's right of access with  
7 respect to information pertaining to third party salary and employment separation information).

8 **II. CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Court order the  
10 portions of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motions *In Limine* and the Shaver Declaration Exhibits  
11 identified in each Defendant's declaration to be placed under seal. A proposed order granting  
12 Defendants' sealing requests is being filed concurrently herewith. With the exception of the  
13 Shaver Declaration Exhibits corresponding to expert reports (which were previously submitted to  
14 this Court in redacted form pursuant to prior sealing motions, as detailed above), Defendants are  
15 also concurrently filing on ECF sealed versions of the documents sought to be sealed with  
16 highlights indicating the proposed redactions and will submit Chambers Copies of the same.

17 Dated: April 21, 2014                           MAYER BROWN LLP

19 By:    /s/ Lee H. Rubin  
20   Lee H. Rubin

21   Lee H. Rubin  
22   Edward D. Johnson  
23   Donald M. Falk  
24   Two Palo Alto Square  
25   3000 El Camino Real, Suite 300  
26   Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112  
27   Telephone: (650) 331-2057  
28   Facsimile: (650) 331-4557

25   KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

27   By:   /s/ Robert A. Van Nest

1 Robert A. Van Nest

2 Robert A. Van Nest  
3 Daniel Purcell  
4 Eugene M. Paige  
5 Justina Sessions  
6 633 Battery Street  
7 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
8 Telephone: (415) 391-5400  
9 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

10 *Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.*

11 Dated: April 21, 2014 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

12 By: /s/ Michael F. Tubach  
13 Michael F. Tubach

14 George Riley  
15 Michael F. Tubach  
16 Christina J. Brown  
17 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor  
18 San Francisco, CA 94111  
19 Telephone: (415) 984-8700  
20 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701

21 *Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.*

22 Dated: April 21, 2014 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

23 By: /s/ Gregory P. Stone  
24 Gregory P. Stone

25 Gregory P. Stone  
26 Bradley S. Phillips  
27 Steven M. Perry  
28 Gregory Sergi  
355 South Grande Ave., 35th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

35 *Attorneys for Defendant INTEL CORPORATION*

1 Dated: April 21, 2014

JONES DAY

2  
3 By: /s/ David C. Kiernan  
4 David C. Kiernan

5 Robert A. Mittelstaedt  
6 Lin W. Kahn  
7 555 California Street, 26th Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94104  
9 Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
10 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

11 *Attorneys for Defendant ADOBE SYSTEMS, INC.*

12 Dated: April 21, 2014

JONES DAY

13 By: /s/ Robert A. Mittelstaedt  
14 Robert A. Mittelstaedt

15 Craig E. Stewart  
16 Roberta Tonelli  
17 555 California Street, 26th Floor  
18 San Francisco, CA 94104  
19 Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
20 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

21 Catherine T. Broderick  
22 1755 Embarcadero Road  
23 Palo Alto, CA 94303  
24 Telephone: (650) 739-3939  
25 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900

26 *Attorneys for Defendant INTUIT INC.*

27 **ATTESTATION:** The filer attests that concurrence in the filing of this document has been  
28 obtained from all signatories.